

REMARKS

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the application in view of the amendments and arguments presented below.

Summary of Office Action

Claims 1-28 are pending.

Claims 10 and 22 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112.

Claims 1-5, 7-16, 18, 21, and 25-28 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102 as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 7,092,517 of Pruecklmayer, et al. ("Pruecklmayer").

Claims 6, 19, 17, 20, 22, 23, and 24 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Pruecklmayer in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,911,809 of Kernahan ("Kernahan").

Summary of Amendments

Claims 1-4, 6-9, 11-15, 17-25, and 27-28 were amended. Claims 10 and 26 were canceled. Applicant respectfully submits that cancellation of claims 10 and 26 and the amendment of claims 1-4, 6-9, 11-15, 17-25, and 27-28 do not add new matter.

Comment

Applicant submits that the claims of another application (10/750,415) were previously provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obvious-type double-patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-28 of this application. At the time of that Office Action (June 15, 2006), applicant argued that the requirement was premature because the present application was not a patent. That other application has since issued as U.S. Patent No. 7,239,697.

In addition, claims of yet another application, 10/750,559 were provisionally rejected over claim 19 of application 10/750,415. Applicant

ultimately filed a terminal disclaimer in the 10/750,559 application to overcome the rejection.

Applicant submits that the Examiner may want to consider a resolution regarding possible double-patenting rejections among 10/750,415 (the present application), 10/750,414 (U.S. Patent No. 7,239,697), and 10/750,559 with respect to these provisional rejections. A terminal disclaimer in the present case may be warranted given the status of the other applications/patents.

Response to 35 U.S.C. § 112 rejections

Claims 10 and 22 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112. Claim 10 was identified as indefinite due to the use of the term “and/or”. Claim 22 was identified as having insufficient antecedent basis for the term “the loop filter”.

Claim 10 was canceled. None of the remaining claims have the term “and/or”.

Claim 22 was amended. Applicant respectfully submits that the term “the loop filter” is not present in claim 22 as amended.

Applicant respectfully submits that the 35 U.S.C. § 112 rejections have been overcome.

Response to 35 U.S.C. § 102 rejections

Claims 1-5, 7-16, 18, 21, and 25-28 were rejected as being anticipated by Pruecklmayer. Applicant submits none of claims 1-5, 7-16, 18, 21, and 25-28 is anticipated by Pruecklmayer. In particular, *Pruecklmayer does not teach or disclose: dynamically controlling at least one power supply controller parameter as the supply level controller controls the variable power supply to the electronic device, wherein the at least one controller parameter corresponds to at least one of a control system loop filter compensator setting, a digital-to-analog converter setting, and an analog-to-digital converter setting.*

The extent of the control disclosed by Pruecklmayer appears to be limited to controlling the pulse width of the modulated pulse width modulator.

Moreover, this pulse width appears to be selected prior to any transision between supply levels and does not appear to be dynamically varied during the transition (Pruecklmayer, col. 6, lines 27-38).

Accordingly Pruecklmayer does not teach or disclose: *dynamically controlling at least one power supply controller parameter as the supply level controller controls the variable power supply to the electronic device, wherein the at least one controller parameter corresponds to at least one of a control system loop filter compensator setting, a digital-to-analog converter setting, and an analog-to-digital converter setting.*

In contrast, claims 1, 12, and 27 include the language:

1. A method comprising:
controlling a variable power supply to supply power to an electronic device at different supply levels; and
dynamically controlling a value of at least one power supply controller parameter in controlling the variable power supply to supply power to the electronic device, wherein the at least one controller parameter corresponds to at least one of a control system loop filter compensator setting, a digital-to-analog converter setting, and an analog-to-digital converter setting.

(Claim 1, as amended)(*emphasis added*)

12. An electronic device comprising:
a supply level controller coupled to control a variable power supply to supply power to the electronic device at different supply levels; and
a controller parameter(s) controller coupled to dynamically control at least one power supply controller parameter for the supply level controller as the supply level controller controls the variable power supply to supply power to the electronic device, wherein the at least one controller parameter corresponds to at least one of a control system loop filter compensator setting, a digital-to-analog converter setting, and an analog-to-digital converter setting.

(Claim 12, as amended)(*emphasis added*)

27. An apparatus comprising:
means for controlling a variable power supply to supply power to an electronic device at different supply levels; and
means for dynamically controlling a value of at least one power supply controller parameter as the variable power supply is controlled, wherein the at least one controller parameter corresponds to at least one of a control system loop filter compensator setting, a digital-to-analog converter setting, and an analog-to-digital converter setting.

(Claim 27, as amended)(*emphasis added*)

Thus applicant submits claims 1, 12, and 27 are not anticipated by Pruecklmayer. Given that claims 2-9 and 11 depend from claim 1, claims 13-25 depend from claim 12, and claim 28 depends from claim 27, applicant submits claims 2-9, 11, 13-25, and 28 are likewise not anticipated by the cited references.

Applicant respectfully submits that the 35 U.S.C. § 102 rejections have been overcome.

Response to 35 U.S.C. § 103 rejection

Claims 6, 17, 19, 20, 22, 23, and 24 were rejected as being unpatentable over Pruecklmayer in view of Kernahan. Applicant submits, however, that claims 6, 17, 19, 20, 22, 23, and 24 are dependent claims and that Kernahan does not resolve the deficiencies of Pruecklmayer argued above with respect to the 35 U.S.C. § 102 rejections. Accordingly, applicant submits claims 1, 12, and 27 are patentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103 in view of the cited references.

Given that claims 2-9 and 11 depend from claim 1, claims 13-25 depend from claim 12, and claim 28 depends from claim 27, applicant submits claims 2-9, 11, 13-25, and 28 are likewise patentable over the cited references.

Applicant respectfully submits that the 35 U.S.C. § 103 rejections have been overcome.

Conclusion

In view of the amendments and arguments presented above, applicant respectfully submits the applicable rejections and objections have been overcome. Accordingly, claims 1-9, 11-25, and 27-28 as amended should be found to be in condition for allowance.

If there are any issues that can be resolved by telephone conference, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned at (512) 858-9910.

Respectfully submitted,

Date December 21, 2007

William D. Davis

William D. Davis
Reg. No. 38,428

DAVIS & ASSOCIATES
P.O. Box 1093
Dripping Springs, TX 78620